



THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD--OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

NO. 26.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.]

[SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1836.]

THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
NO. 46, WASHINGTON STREET, BY
ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

•TWO DOLLARS per annum, always payable in advance. All letters and communications must be post paid. The rule of postmasters, to order to withhold us from the frequent insertion of our names. Those, therefore, who wish their letters to be received from the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay their postage. An advertisement making one square, or a space of equal dimensions, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

EXTRACTS FROM GOV. HILL'S MESSAGE.

"Among the topics which are agitating the public mind, the subject of servitude of the African race has been prominent. We must take things as they are—not as we would have them to be. That slavery has been introduced in a portion of the country, is the *misfortune*, not the *fault* of the present generation.—The whites bound the color of race unaccustomed to take charge of their own conduct, and fit only for servitude. Whoever has assumed, in any slaveholding community, the relations usually existing between master and slave, views this matter, in quite a different light than what is the general impression in a country where there are no two races of human beings standing in those relations. If the black is made inferior and subservient to the white man it ought not to be considered as of necessity that the one is miserable and the other cruel—that the slave, beyond others of his race abject and degraded, and the master supercilious and overbearing, are mutual relations existing between the master and his slave, which often endear the one to the other; and probably in all those States where manual labor is performed by slaves, there exists not less affection and kindness between the employers and the employed than in those States where slavery is not tolerated. So far as my knowledge extends—and I am informed the feeling prevails through the whole south—it is considered *disrespectable* for the master to maltreat his slave—as much or more so as it is in New England for the master to abuse his apprentice, or for an employer to impose hardships on those whom he has in charge. [Will Mr. Hill surrender all his rights into the hands of any man who will buy him, with no other protection than the bad reputation his *owner* would acquire by abusing him? If this argument is good, then abolish slaves, and let rights be protected only by reputation.] And it is a general sentiment among the colored people themselves, that the slave who has a kind master stands in a caste higher than the black or colored person who is free and obliged to provide for and take care of him or herself. *Certainly* it is that the moral condition of the great body of the slaves is *far better* than that of the same race where they exist in numbers in free States."

Such, in my estimation, is the obligation of the free States to the co-States where slavery exists, that it is the duty of their legislatures to intercede in the prevention of all attempts having in view the intention to excite revolt among the present servile race, whenever such interference can be exercised without invading the rights of our own citizens. When flagrant acts, calculated to incite the colored slave race of any portion of the country to rise upon the free white race, shall be tangible, it will be the duty of the Legislature to impose a remedy as far as it may be authorized by the great principles of the constitutional charters under which we live, taking care that in our efforts to protect others we do not invade the natural and inalienable rights of our own citizens."

* * * * *

"A fact worthy the attention of people residing in that part of the country where slavery does not exist is that not one in a thousand even of those benevolent persons who view slavery, in the abstract, as one of the greatest moral evils, and who would go all lengths in the work of emancipation, would let the colored people themselves, that the slave who has a kind master stands in a caste higher than the black or colored person who is free and obliged to provide for and take care of him or herself. *Certainly* it is that the moral condition of the great body of the slaves is *far better* than that of the same race where they exist in numbers in free States."

SPEECH OF REV. T. S. WRIGHT AT THE N. E. A. S. CONVENTION.

REV. JAMES MILLIGAN of Ryegate, Vt. offered the following:

Resolved, That in carrying forward this great work, we most strive to act in accordance with the will of God.

REV. THEODORE S. WRIGHT, of New York, pastor of a Presbyterian Church in the city of New York, seconded the resolution. We give his language, as near as possible, precisely as he spoke, in order that those who doubt the capacity of the colored man, may, if they are candid, judge from the ease of Mr. Wright, what might be done, if the colored race enjoyed the same means and incentives for intellectual culture as the whites.

Mr. President, (said Mr. Wright) were it not for the fact that humanity is suffering, and suffering in the race to which I belong—black-men of my own color; and were it not that—I have been requested to speak, I should not venture to open my mouth in an assembly, where there are so many of my friends, so much better able to plead the cause of humanity. Sir, I am identified with two millions and a half of men, women, and children, whose minds, as well as their bodies, are chained down and crushed by slavery, and who have no power to speak for themselves. Every one of them, if their voice could reach my ears, would say—"Vengeance is mine!—Oh, plead for us!" They would say, "Oh! if I were in your place, how I would speak and plead for myself, and for my fellow-sufferers!" Let me then, sir, say a few words.

If the two millions and a half of slaves in these United States, could lift up their heads, bowed low, and look upon this assembly, and see the noble spirits that are laboring in the cause of humanity, with the spirit of the gospel, they would exclaim, go on; go on, in the spirit of the resolution, and as the big tears rolled down their cheeks, they would praise God for what he was doing for them, and learn to pray for grace to wait patiently till the time of their deliverance shall come. They would say to you, not to be discouraged—they would say to the professing Christians of this land, not to reproach them, but they would say, "The spirit of Christianity is the love of God, and God tells you, if you love him, to love your neighbor. We are your neighbors, and you see us down-trodden and poor, and blind, and naked: you see the spirit of oppression abroad, crushing our souls and bodies to the dust, and you hear God commanding you to go to the oppressors, and in his name to call upon them to undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free. We can't do it. You have the laws in your hands. We

slaveholders who had taken or were anxious to take measures gradually and safely to manumit their slaves, should induce such persons as extend their enquiries no further than the abstract proposition that slavery is an evil, to reflect on the consequences of extending charity, more needed nearer home, to objects where its application is ill-timed, and serves to increase the evils it would affect to remedy.

The existence of slavery, admitted on all terms, to be an evil, [For proof, see Bellinger's speech, McDuffie's message, &c. &c.] is not more the fault of the free whites in the slaveholding region than of the whites in the free States. The races of white and black are there, and any sudden change of the relative condition of the two sorts of people must break up the very foundations of society. The inhabitants of the States where slavery does not exist have no greater moral right to interfere for the purpose of bringing about such a change, than have the inhabitants of the slave States to interfere in the relations subsisting between parents and children, between masters and their apprentices, or with the texture by which property is held in the free States. Nay there is a much more potent and conclusive reason for non-interference in the former than in the latter case; because the relations of the one hand may be trenched upon without endangering life, while on the other it will be impossible to touch the blacks not only that they owe no servitude to the whites but that they are their equals and not inferior to them that they are justified in resisting unto blood that state of things which has placed them in a dependent condition.

Such, in my estimation, is the obligation of the free States to the co-States where slavery exists, that it is the duty of their legislatures to intercede in the prevention of all attempts having in view the intention to excite revolt among the present servile race, whenever such interference can be exercised without invading the rights of our own citizens. When flagrant acts, calculated to incite the colored slave race of any portion of the country to rise upon the free white race, shall be tangible, it will be the duty of the Legislature to impose a remedy as far as it may be authorized by the great principles of the constitutional charters under which we live, taking care that in our efforts to protect others we do not invade the natural and inalienable rights of our own citizens."

* * * * *

"The evils of slavery, since the revolution which severed the States from Great Britain, have been greatly mitigated. By the consent of the slaveholding States, the foreign traffic in slaves has been abolished. The domestic traffic—the traffic in slaves between the middle and Southern States, as it has been carried on, is generally disapproved. The humane every where, as well in the South as in the North, would put a stop to it. But the misguided zeal of immediate abolitionists has had the effect of preventing the legislatures of several slaveholding States from moving on this subject, as the same efforts have closed the schools of instruction which humane masters had opened to the slaves."

INHUMAN BARBARY

MR. EDITOR—You appear to have passed over the recent occurrence of *BURNING A MAN, BY A SLOW FIRE* which took place at St. Louis, Missouri, on the 28th of April, without remark.

You have indeed given your readers to understand that such a circumstance did take place, by an item published in your paper of the 18th ult.—But should such an event be allowed to pass without the severest reprobation of every civilized being who makes any pretensions to the common feelings of humanity?

It is a crime, which, considering the public manner in which it was planned, the fiend-like malice which characterized its execution, the deliberation and bare-faced impunity with which the laws were set at defiance, and insulted justice robbed of its victim,—stands without a parallel in the history of our country.

The victim, it seems, was a *freeman*, although tinged with African blood—being a *mulatto*. He had interfered in behalf of an unfortunate fellow-being, and assisted him to escape from an officer. Thus, in an American, on a foreign shore, would have been considered an act of heroism highly praiseworthy. He pilfered his own liberty and life to serve one of his countrymen. When taken, he made an effort to escape, and in so doing he killed one officer, and it was supposed mortally wounded another. This circumstance, however, affords but a shadow of an apology for the outrage of the mob. We have laws, by which all offenders may be arraigned, and if found guilty, punished. By those laws this offender should have been tried, and if condemned, suffer the penalty of his crime. But it seems justice was like to be too tardy in its operations to suit the infatuated populace of St. Louis. "Vengeance is mine; I will repay," saith the Lord. "Vengeance is ours, and we will pour it in full measure upon this vile mulatto,"—say these magnanimous and enlightened civilians—citizens of a country which makes freedom its boast, and whose motto is, "ALL MEN ARE BORN FREE AND EQUAL."

Our Constitution guarantees to all citizens, the privilege of trial by jury, for all crimes, except in cases of impeachment. This proceeding is therefore a most flagrant outrage on our Constitutional rights.

In several states, the person who abuses his cat-

tle is liable to prosecution and fine. And the

monster who should burn an ox or a horse to death by a slow fire, however obstinate the animal might have been, would be held up before the public as a fiend, unfit to associate with human beings, or share the privileges of society. What then shall we say of those who could burn a man?

It appears he suffered like a hero. A correspondent of the Evening Gazette, who was present and witnessed the horrid transaction, says, "Not a single scream escaped him. His chest heaved with the most intense agony, yet all he said was 'God take my soul!—God take my life!' in accents so low that none except those immediately about him could catch the sound." Well he knew that supplications for mercy to the demons with which he was surrounded, would be vain. It is most devoutly to be hoped, however, that his cries to his Maker were not disregarded.

Can such atrocities be perpetrated with impunity? No. Although these Heaven-daring monsters may for a time be allowed to violate the Constitution of our country, and trample its wholesome laws under their feet—there is a higher power; and sooner or later they cannot fail to draw down the vengeance of insulted Deity on the devoted country that will tolerate such proceedings.

"Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered?"—Thus with the Devil, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be devoured? "And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine."

H. W.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

—We are authorized to promise our readers a rich feast, in the accounts which a number of the delegates have promised to furnish for the watchman, concerning the doings of this body at its recent meeting in Cincinnati.

We take this opportunity to record in our columns the names of those men of God, who refused to bow down to the image of slavery in that body, on the memorable 13th ult.

From the Pittsburg Conference.

J. S. Barri.

From the New England Conference.

Joseph A. Merrill, Phineas Crandall, Isaac Bonney, Charles Vergin,

From the New Hampshire Conference.

John F. Adams, E. Scott, George Storrs, E. J. Scott, Samuel Norris, Jared Perkins, C. D. Colson, S. Chamberlain, Samuel Kelly,

From the Maine Conference.

Moses Hill, and we rejoice to say, he was from the Maine Conference; he would have voted with the above named few, but for his absence from the Conference room at the time the resolutions were passed. —Zion's Watchman.

[From the Glasgow Chronicle of April 19.]

MR. GEORGE THOMPSON.

We take the following account of Mr. Thompson's visit to Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and a sketch of that gentleman's speech at the Peace Meeting, from the Tyne Mercury of the 12th inst.:

Mr. Thompson, during the last two weeks, has afforded to the inhabitants of Newcastle a high intellectual treat. He is one of the most powerful and accomplished orators that ever graced a platform; but, above all, his modest demeanor, his Christian beneficence towards all, and particularly his ardent and well directed advocacy of the oppressed Negro in our Colonies and in America, have left an impression on the minds of his numerous and crowded audiences that will not readily be effaced, and has given such an impetus to the Anti-Slavery Societies of Newcastle, as it is hoped, will not be abated until the last link of the vast chain of Slavery throughout the world is broken. Mr. Thompson also delivered speeches at two Missionary meetings and at meetings of the Temperance and Peace Societies, crowded almost to suffocation. It is impossible to describe the pleasing and fascinating effect of his eloquence; it must be heard to give a correct idea of it.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF PERMANENT AND UNIVERSAL PEACE.

On Thursday evening last, the anniversary meeting of the above society was held at Brunswick Place Chapel the Rev. Mr. Pengilly in the chair. The Chairman, in opening the business, briefly commented on the horrid nature of war, as being opposed to the spirit of Christianity; and intimated to the meeting that their respected friend Mr. Pilkington, and the able and eloquent advocate of Universal Emancipation, Mr. George Thompson, would address them on the occasion.

The Rev. Mr. Orange then read the report, which congratulated the nation on the preservation of peace; and Mr. Priestman having read the treasurer's account, which left a balance of £6 in the society's hands, the Rev. Mr. Reid moved that the report be adopted, which was seconded by Mr. Priestman.

Mr. GEO. RICHARDSON moved the second resolution, in an appropriate speech, which was seconded by Mr. Pilkington.

The Rev. Mr. ORANGE moved the next resolution, and complimented the nation on its commercial prosperity, and stated that since peace had been established taxes to the amount of eleven millions of money had been repealed; after which

Mr. THOMPSON rose to second the motion, and was received with enthusiastic applause. When

the shot was being fired or even the smell of gunpowder, recently invited to visit Newcastle upon Tyne, (said Mr. T.) he had no idea of being so frequently called upon to appear before public assemblies—nor of the variety of benevolent enterprises, it would be his privilege to recommend to the countenance and care of those whom he had the honor to address. He gladly consented to plead the cause of Education amongst the Negroes of the British Colonies—as gladly did he stand forth as the advocate of Universal Emancipation, and he rejoiced that Societies had been formed to advance that glorious object. He had also with much readiness appeared as the advocate of the immediate and entire abolition of the guilty, degrading and voluntary bondage of intemperance. He could, however, truly say, that with equal pleasure, he stood forth as the advocate of the principles of permanent and universal peace. Though he had only once before appeared on the platform of the Peace Society, he had frequently introduced the subject, incidentally, into his public addresses, and he trusted he should suffer no opportunity of recommending the principles of the Society to pass unimproved. He (Mr. T.) carried his Peace principles to the fullest possible extent. He considered war unlawful, under all possible, all conceivable circumstances. He denied the right of any mortal man to take the life of another. (Approval.) In taking these views of war, and punishment, and self-defence, he of course, stood upon Christian principles. He spoke as a Christian to Christian men. He asked 'what is it to be a Christian?' The reply was to be like Christ. In reference, therefore, to any circumstances in which he might be placed he had but to set the example of his divine Redeemer before him, and ask 'How would he have acted in such circumstances?' So doing he (Mr. T.) seldom found any difficulty in deciding. He confessed, that in looking over the face of his beloved country, he could not join with those who called it a *Christian country*. In every direction he saw the paraphernalia of war, offensive and defensive. Our history was a history of bloody wars. The demon of desolation had deprived us of £400,000,000 sterling of treasure, and of 200,000,000 of our sons. Call us a nation of civilised savages, of wholesale butchers, of sanguinary unpeasable murderers, but call us not a nation of *Christians* till we have more consistently exemplified the doctrines of the prince of peace! He might, if he had time, dwell upon the causes, preliminaries, progress, consummation, and consequences of war, and show that in its principles, participations, and effects, it was 'evil' and 'only evil.' This work he believed, however, had been done thoroughly by his friend Mr. Pilkington. He regretted that such false views of honor and glory were entertained by youth generally. He believed, however, that the patriotism and courage of our modern warriors were in most instances inspired by the extrinsic blandishments of the profession. See yonder troop exciting the admiration of a gaping crowd—every female sighing for a hero as her lover, and every bumpkin panting to share

'The glory and the guilt of war.'

What is it thus steals away their hearts? Is it love of country? No. Is it hatred of their country's foes? No. What then? The martial music—the stately tramp—the nodding plume—the waving banner—the crimson sash—the worsted epaulettes;—these were the things in which the charms of a military life were found. Instead of the ordinary aids, and garnishments, and implements of war, let them be sent into the field in ordinary apparel, with no other weapons but those which nature has given them; and let them, at some signal, fly at each other's throats, with tooth and nail, and gnaw and claw, and beat and bruise, until they were tired; and he believed that wars would be less frequent, less popular, less destructive, and certainly less expensive. The fact was, that war depended very much for its attractions, upon worsted, and broadcloth, and parchment, and Day & Martin's blacking. All these things he considered vain, guilty, and anti-Christian. Christianity was the same now in spirit as it was of old, and he adverted to the opinions of some men of the most celebrated piety and learning, whose declarations against war were, 'that as Christians, they could not, dare not, or would not fight,' and were they then at this present period still upholding a system that our fathers of old so boldly denounced? The principle of the Christian was not to resist evil, but to overcome evil with good—to love their enemies, and love them even as friends. Who could stand on more elevated ground? Mr. Thompson then cited a case arising from the supposition of some valiant youth being present that he was thirsting for glory, and might think that he (Mr. T.) was a coward and a pretty fellow to be a defender of his country. He would say to that young person that it required more courage to be a man of peace than a man of war. He would tell him that he could walk on the most barren and lonely heath at night, where the gibbet swing and the footpad lay in ambush, with a calm and steady purpose, without a single weapon of defence; while others armed themselves for their protection. Still pursuing his solitary course, the footpad marks his coming, and by the beams of the moon they mark his person. Having come up they demand his purse or life. The man of peace gives up his purse as trash, and is permitted to pass without further harm. Not so with the person armed—the footpad note his weapons, and he concealed lest they should be injured instead of injuring; they mark him for their deadly aim, and both murder and rob him. Thus we see the man of peace succeeds, and quietly passes on, trusting in the potency of his principles. Mr. T. cited one or two more cases, where the man of peace trusted not on worldly assistance for protection, and observed that he relied on the promises of God, who had numbered the hairs of their heads, and permitted not a sparrow to fall to the ground without his knowledge. And even let us suppose that the principles of peace were adopted by any one whom God would not preserve by an especial intercession of Providence. The simple fact of having taken up those principles would lead him to the very first thing to question himself in regard to being prepared to die. Mr. Thompson then recorded some facts from history, and alluded to the settlement of Pennsylvania having been established without one

shot being fired or even the smell of gunpowder;

and the first man that was killed on the settlement was shot by an Indian who thought the man was going to kill him. In the Irish rebellion the dwellings of 'The Friends' were spared; and in America any one acquainted with its history would see that those persons possessing peace principles conciliated the Indians. In Massachusetts he learned the history of a farmer, whom the Indian savages never harmed, while they pillaged and murdered his neighbors around—they never passed his door without calling him the man of peace. While the lamented Richard Lander was wandering in the interior of Africa, he was suddenly surrounded by hundreds of savages, who at the sign of their chief levelled their arrows dipped with poison at our countryman, and at another sign the arrows would have pierced his body, but that Lander had the presence of mind to fling instantly from him on the ground his arms, and with open hands approached the chief, who at another given signal caused the arrows to be pointed to the ground. Thus he had the practical uses of the society developed fully in those facts. It had been said, that if England did not fight she was liable to be invaded by every ambitious tyrant. He (Mr. T.) would like to see an Armaada approaching our ois to attack a nation of peaceful men and women. The principles of peace should be disseminated and cultivated all over the world; nations should act as individuals, and that time would soon approach—the triumphs of the Millennium. The passage of scripture referred to by Mr. Pilkington, viz.—whosoever sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed? was now, he considered, as a law merely to gratify the ambition of man. Some would go on doubting, although 999 points out of a thousand were made clear to them, yet, who would still act upon the one that was doubtful; and although that doubt might be resolved, yet still they would go on killing all the time. Man for his purposes would go as far back as the antediluvian times, to quote for authority to kill. Mr. T. then contended that the milder the laws were, the more efficient would they be found, and related an interesting fact which occurred in America, in a prison at Connecticut, the master of which was noted for his rigid discipline, and kind and benevolent disposition. It happened that some prisoners, who had been employed in some public works that had just been finished, were removed into the custody of this gaoler. Previous to their arrival he had received a book of their names, detailing the nature of their character and conduct. Among them was a very old man, who had been 17 years a prisoner, and who was set forth to be incorrigible and totally irreclaimable. This old man was brought to him heavily laden with irons, and when the master cast his eyes upon him, he instantly ordered them to be knocked off, and going up to him, said, 'Old man, you are old enough to be my father, and those chains are not fit for you.' The man stood stupefied and amazed, but did not utter a word. The master of the gaol after this sent for the old man to come into his private room, to hear the orders and discipline of the prison read over. He was then sent to work; and for two months this man conducted himself with satisfaction. After this period, however, the master had twice observed some faults committed by him, and again sent for him and remonstrated with him in kind terms. The master charged him with a breach of the prison laws, and told the old man that he might punish him for the offence by sending him to a cell where the light of heaven never entered, and the human voice was never heard; but to an old man like him he could not do it. The old man again stared in astonishment, and at last ejaculated 'what did he mean—for he had never for 17 long years heard tones of kindness used towards him; he could bear the whip, the irons, and even the gallows itself; but this mark of kindness he could not bear,' and he burst into tears. Let us learn from this fact to try the milder system before the severe and harsh one. It was natural for them to be ruled by love more than by fear; every thing in creation showed this fact. If this principle was taken up, how soon would it spread into their system of education, and even into their legislature, for he regretted to say, they had not as yet received this great moral and religious principle. Mr. T. then ridiculed the idea of chivalry and deeds of fame, and illustrated the state of feelings which pervaded the breasts of thousands the moment before the battle, when the trumpet's shrill blast was echoing from line to line, the drum rolling and the banner waving, and all arrayed—

'Big with the fate of Cato and of Rome.'

At that moment what thoughts of home have occupied the soldier's breast, and of his fate whether he would return or not. Mr. T. after a few more remarks, concluded a highly interesting, powerful, and eloquent speech, by exhorting the audience as Christians to support the propagation of peace,—for if all societies acted upon the truth of the gospel they would all become peace societies. Let the cruelty of slavery and the despotism of war be linked together, and banished into that hell whence they originated. He would now part from them in peace. He had first come to appeal for the oppressed slave, however feeble his efforts had been, and he now left them advocates of the cause of universal peace.

[From the Illinois Patriot.]

JUDGE LAWLESS' CHARGE.

[A JUDGE RIGHTLY NAMED.]

The Missouri republican of last Tuesday contains a large portion of the charge of Judge Lawless to the Grand Jury of St. Louis County. Were this an ordinary document of its kind, as it was addressed to a Jury in another State, it would not, of course, elicit any remark from this quarter. But the principles laid down and advocated in it are so singular, that we bespeak for it a notoriety, such as no production of its species has ever had, and our principle regret is that we cannot lay it in its length and breadth, before our readers this week.

Such a wonderful coincidence in the name of the author and the character of the production as we find exemplified in this charge, we have never before seen. From what we have heard of the character of the man, we do not wonder at his falling in with the popular prejudices that have so extensively manifested themselves against the abolitionists, without examining or refuting their principles or their motives, and denouncing them all as a set of base incendiaries and a band of traitors to their country. But for one who occupies the solemn and responsible office of an expounder of the Laws, to advance such a doctrine as is contained in the following extracts from his Charge, was indeed unexpected, and if adopted will lead to the most alarming consequences:—In speaking of the murder of Hammond and the burning of McIntosh, he says:

'I have reflected much on this matter, and after weighing all the considerations that present themselves as bearing upon it, I feel it my duty to state my opinion to be, that whether the Grand Jury shall act at all, depends upon the solution of this preliminary question, namely, whether the destruction of McIntosh was the act of the "few" or the act of the "many."

'If, on a calm view of the circumstances attending this dreadful transaction, you shall be of opinion that it was perpetrated by a definite, and, compared to the population of St. Louis, a small number of individuals, separate from the mass, and evidently taking upon themselves, as contradistinct from the multitude, the responsibility

of the act, my opinion is that you ought to indict them all without a single exception.'

'If on the other hand, the destruction of the murderer of Hammond was the act as I have said, of the many—the of the multitude, in the ordinary sense of those words—not the act of numerable and ascertainable malefactors, but of congregated thousands, seized upon and impelled by that mysterious, metaphysical, and almost electric frenzy, which in all ages and nations, has hurried on the infuriated multitude to deeds of death and destruction—then, I say, act not at all in the matter—the case then transcends your jurisdiction—it is beyond the reach of human law.'

If the doctrine laid down in the above extract receives the sanction of the people, what security have we for the continuance of those rights and privileges which are guaranteed by the Constitution to every American Citizen? None, whatever. Such a doctrine lays the axe at the very root of our liberties. Such a doctrine will open wide the floodgates of anarchy and bloodshed, and will fill this fair land with lamentation and woe. Nullification—it is worse—in our opinion it is high Treason.'

[From the Philadelphia Independent Press.]

In another column will be found the infamous charge of a Missouri Judge, to a Grand Jury, respecting the barbarous conduct of a mob in *burning alive a human being!* According to this Judge's exposition of law, if the act had been committed by a *few*, it would have been monstrous; but being the act of the *many*, its enormity is taken away, and it becomes even paramount to law!!! We confess that we tremble at the thought of the destruction which must await any republic, so destitute of principle—so prostituted to prejudice and injustice—so thoroughly under the control of conscience-hardened, satanic monsters, in the shape of slaveholders and mobocrats.

When Santa Anna, in order to exterminate slavery, had a number of rebels shot, who were endeavoring to introduce slavery where freedom was proclaimed by law, the whole of the editorial corps indulged in their anathemas, and held up the President of Mexico as a cold-blooded monster. Were they sincere in their detestation of bloodshed, or was it to please their southern and northern pro-slavery subscribers? The reader can judge when he observes their silence with regard to, or palliation of this atrocious barbarity in St. Louis, with which Santa Anna's conduct cannot bear a comparison.

In New York, the Journeymen Tailors have been indicted and punished not only for rioting but even for combining together; the law could seize upon them (though many) without any difficulty; they were mechanics, however. Moreover, the man burned at St. Louis was only a Negro, and the rioters were 'gentlemen of property and standing'; it is impossible, therefore, that *they* can be convicted—the act is beyond the reach of law, and being the act of the 'many,' is humane, right, republican, Christianlike! We blush—we tremble for our country.

JUDGE EDWARD'S DECISION.

If this were not a day of wonders, we should have been greatly surprised on reading this decision. But having seen Justices and honorable men at the head of a mob,—having read the reports of our Congress men, in which the spirit of the Constitution is assailed, and the freedom of speech and of the press destroyed,—having seen, and heard, and felt in ten thousand different forms, that SLAVERY has an ascendancy, even here, at the North—what else could we expect? The decision is exactly in accordance with the age, Judge Edwards is himself a *slave*, thinking, speaking, acting, at the direction of an aristocratic and pro-slavery public sentiment. Let any candid man look at his decision, and say, whether it is characterized by justice or republican spirit. Were the accused guilty of rioting or assault, we should wish to see a full punishment awarded to them. But their only offence consisted in combining together for the promotion of their interests. And was this unlawful? England abolished all her laws which prevented combinations in 1824, and is America less free? Moreover, it is not lawful for lawyers, with whom Judge Edwards is associated, to combine together, and brand with the odious name of pettifogger, any man who will injure the profession, by transacting legal business at a lower fee than that established by the combination. It is not lawful for physicians, for merchants, for employers of any class, to combine together—and such would be the decision of the learned and balance-holding Judge. Is any one disposed to ask

'Why such difference there should be.'

'Twixt tweedle dum and tweedle dee.'

We would remind him, that slavery has embraced the North in her grasp, and that the persons sentenced are laborers, who is, (according to Southern views) slaves, and have no reason to look for fair-handed justice.

One word to working men. The abolitionists predicted this long since, and their prophecies were treated with a smile. You now see the fulfillment—from this time, therefore, let the resolution be formed, to strike at the root of your evils—and labor unceasingly, until not a fetter shall be forged—not a chain shall be worn in this land.—*Ibid.*

[From the Free Discussion Advocate.]

LETTER FROM MR. WELD.

TROY, JUNE 11, 1836.

In my letter of a week ago, I expressed the hope, if I mistake not, that matters here would take such a turn as to admit of my being with you. * * * * * That hope I have entirely given up. Since my last, we have been mobbed again, in the same time. The mayor and the city officers were with a few exceptions, totally inefficient, and pursued such a course as to embolden rather than to intimidate the mob. One of the city officers was openly a leader of the mob. Twice a rush was made up the aisles to drag me from the pulpit. Stones, pieces of bricks, eggs, cents, sticks, &c., were thrown at me while speaking.

As I came out of the house, and while going the whole distance to my lodgings, I was a target for all sorts of missiles—was hit by twostones, though not hurt seriously. The mob made desperate efforts to get me into their clutches, but were kept at bay by our friends, though often with extreme difficulty—but I have not time to detail. Suffice it to say, the mayor and common council declare that they cannot keep the peace of the city, that they cannot protect the citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights!! * * *

Anti-Absolution fury, after being pent up, for a few months, is breaking out anew and with deadlier hate than ever. Let every abolitionist decide the matter, once for all, and settle it with himself; whether he is an abolitionist from impulse or principle—whether he can lie upon the rack—and clasp the faggot—and tread with steady step the scaffold—whether he can stand at the post of duty and having done all, and suffered all, stand—and, if cloven down, fall and die a martyr, 'not accepting deliverance.' O, what revelations of character have been made by this question, and yet, these are but the shadow of those to come.

Poor, outside whitewash! the tempest will batter it off the first, stroke; and mask and veils, and sheep clothing gone, gone at the first blast of fire. God gird us all to do valiantly for the

helpless and innocent. Blessed are they who die in the harness and are buried on the field, or bleach there.

In haste, your brother,
in prayer, peril, and abounding hope,
THEODORE D. WELD.

[From the Philanthropist.]

PERSECUTION OF DR. NELSON.

From a friend who writes us from Illinois, we learn the following particulars communicated to him by Dr. Nelson himself. On the previous Sabbath, the Doctor had preached at one of his accustomed places—at the request of a gentleman present, [Mr. Meldrow, we presume,] he read a paper containing some plan or proposition in relation to *COLONIZATION*. After the reading of the paper, Dr. Bosley seemed very much excited, and advanced, with his stick raised, towards Mr. Meldrow, who was supposed to be the author of the paper just read.—Some angry talk ensued—followed by a scuffle, in which Bosley was stabbed. Meldrow was put in confinement.

So great was the excitement against Dr. Nelson, that he was compelled, with his family, to fly to a place of safety. Mrs. Nelson and her oldest son succeeded in conveying themselves and the smaller children to the Mississippi river, and across to Quincy. Dr. N. has a large family of children. So implacable was the spirit aroused against him—that it was extended even to his wife and children. All persons were forbidden from rendering them any assistance. Some, that were truly friendly, were afraid to give them a mouthful of victuals; and thus were they under the necessity of spending the greater part of the night in the woods, travelling till two o'clock in the morning, before they could obtain admittance into any house. Doctor N. was compelled to separate from his family, being hunted like a mad dog. He lay concealed during the day, and, trained in the night—and eventually succeeded, by the aid of some, who secretly befriended him, in reaching Quincy. All the time that he was out, the roads were traversed and the ferries on the river were watched by armed men, who threatened him with death and all manner of punishment.

Dr. Bosley and Mr. Meldrow, both removed from Kentucky to Missouri.

Our correspondent further states—that Doctor N. is homeless and in a great measure friendless

—and that beside many others, those who showed his wife and children the least kindness, have been ordered to leave the country.

Can any comment on such an outrage as this be necessary, in a land claiming to be the freest on the globe—and enlightened, too, by the untrained influences of the Christian religion? The actual slaveholders in Marion county, Missouri, where these things took place, do not amount probably to more than *three hundred* persons.

Yet by their unanimous action, through their

concert, do they continue to keep in awe, and to control, a population of, perhaps twenty times their own number. After the slaveholding atrocities of the last ten months—the insults which have been officially heaped on the free States, by the South—the totally unmanageable and despotic temper, exhibited by slave-holders in Congress, during the session yet holding—the contempt with which our laboring classes have been treated—after all this, we say, if any man is to be found in the free States, who has not resolved to do what he can, to bring to its termination a vile system which threatens to ruin our country, and fill her whole borders with petty tyrants, himself, he has lost the spirit of republicanism; nor does it appear uncharitable, to believe of him, that he either desires the power to become an oppressor himself, or is actuated by that meanness, which would persuade him to receive the chains of a bondman himself; he *contented* in his debasement—and leave the livery of a slave as an inheritance.

Yours, truly, G. W. M'ELROY,
Agt N. Y. and Ky. Col. Society.
June 10, 1836.

only to gratify her children. Known and acknowledged abolitionists, white and black, were busy in this work of (what shall I call it) kidnapping, or enslaving.

To the public I owe a statement of facts in regard to those persons thus decoyed. In regard to the Donalson people, before they could be delivered into my hands or sent from the estate, certain gentlemen had to sign a bond, under the penalty of \$5,000, that they should go to Liberia; this bond was filed in court. In respect to Fisher's, their owner entered his own bond under a penalty of \$3,000. This money is liable to collection, and doubtless will be demanded as soon as this intelligence reaches Nashville. And further, I have in my possession a draft of \$800 to be divided among the Donalson emigrants, not a dollar of which can be drawn until I certify, upon oath, that each one has embarked for Liberia on some vessel chartered for the purpose. If one should refuse to go, the draft can not be honored. There is near \$400 left to Fisher's, in the same way.

But, further, these people, who are thus led off by those so reckless of what they were doing, are free *only* on the condition that they emigrate to Liberia. They have refused, and now it becomes my painful duty, my sworn duty, to write the heirs that they may come and demand them. It is to me painful, because I have every reason to believe they will *ferret them out*; *they assure me they would, even at the expense of \$10,000.*

Thus, while I, and others, have labored for weeks to rescue them from slavery, in a few hours a mingled crowd of white and black have rendered them liable to bondage as perpetually as it may be hopeless and cruel.

An abolition agent and some of the active members of the society in this city were engaged, to what extent I am unable to state. One man, a grocer, an Englishman, whose name I think is Brown, whom I called on to give something to sustain the emigrants, refused sternly, and said he would, however, sustain the whole 2 months if they would remain here. I afterwards saw him among the emigrants, engaged with others of like sentiments in the work which has been effected.—I have just been informed by a Mr. Taylor, who says he is an abolitionist, and who has spent most of the day among the emigrants, that, after ascertaining their condition, he advised them to return to me; and further, he had sent word to their President to use his influence to have them restored. To the public I remark, that I chartered a vessel for \$300 to convey the expedition to Philadelphia. It is now on the way, but still, if those who have decoyed a part of the expedition will send them on so to overtake them at Johnston, or have them in New York by the 20th of this month, I shall still feel bound to receive them; and thus, and thus only, in my view, can we wipe off from themselves the imputation of great guilt, and the condemnation of an outraged people.

Yours, truly, G. W. M'ELROY.

Agt N. Y. and Ky. Col. Society.

June 10, 1836.

On this communication I wish to make a few observations.

They were emancipated, says Mr. McElroy. This I deny. They are *not* emancipated. If they were, with what propriety could Mr. McElroy say, as he does, that it has become his 'painful duty, his sworn duty, to write the heirs that they may come and demand them.' It seems, then, that these 'freemen,' are the property of certain 'heirs,' who have a right to demand them. But it appears a friend at my elbow, don't you see what Mr. McElroy says in another place, 'they are free only on condition that they emigrate to Liberia.' What sort of emancipation is this, to offer a slave his *liberty* on the condition that he shall not use it? Such an offer is a mockery. Those, therefore, whose owners have permitted them to come thus far, are legally slaves, till the conditions are completed, and who in fact must, and do, look up on their transportation to Liberia as only a commutation of punishment, and they have only the poor privilege of choosing either perpetual slavery or banishment from their native land. From what I saw and heard, I feel satisfied that not one of the whole company would voluntarily and of his or her own free will, choose to go to Liberia, and that, therefore, it is as truly a part and parcel of the slave trade to send them to Africa against their will as it was to bring their ancestors from Africa. In both cases, whatever difference there may be in the motives; the effect is the same. Men, women and children, charged with no crime, are constrained to leave their native land and go into perpetual banishment to gratify the feelings of the 'Anglo Saxon race.' 'Your money, or your life,' says the robber, with his pistol at my breast. 'Slavery, or perpetual banishment,' says the slaveholder, with his cart whip in his hand. The one, as far as I can see, has precisely as good a right to impose the alternative, and demand a compliance as the other. To say, as some would, that the slave is already a slave, does not mend the matter. It would not only add insult to injury, but attempt to justify one wrong by the perpetration of another. How, therefore, a violation of the law of love, and the plainest principles of justice can truly be called 'benevolence' I cannot understand.

Again, look at the conditions, the 'bonds,' and the 'penalties,' which were entered into and filed in court, of several thousands of dollars, that they should go to Liberia, which had to be done before they could be 'delivered' into Mr. McElroy's hands.

Why were all these bonds and penalties necessary, and why was the 'owner' of Fisher's

slaves obliged to give his own bond under a penalty of 3000 dollars, unless, as is really the case,

the slaves were to be either sold or banished from the country? That they did not want to go to Africa is very evident from what the heirs and legatees told Mr. McElroy. 'I have every reason to believe,' says he, 'they will ferret them out.'

They assured me they would, even at the expense of \$10,000.' Why this assurance, unless the heirs and legatees expected that they would escape if possible?

When Mr. Clay declared that 'every emigrant to Africa is a *missionary* carrying with him

creed, in the holy cause of civilization, religion

and free institutions,' he could not have had in his mind's eye the company which arrived here yesterday.

A great majority of them cannot read, and many of them cannot tell what country they came from. Some of them, however, were so sensible of their unfitness to be 'missionaries,' that they determined not

to this single point, and they are pathetically implored to break the *galling fetters of slavery*, and let the oppressed go free. Oh, slavery is then represented to be a very horrible condition! i. e. horrible for the ten, or twenty, or one hundred, who are said to be offered to the Society, [mark—not with their own consent, but on the single condition] that they shall be banished—but not horrible, nor unjust, nor unkind, to the millions who are not offered for expatriation! Now, in the first place, it is an atrocious abuse of power for any slaveholder to decree, that the victims of his lust and avarice shall be removed out of this country. He has no more right to make any such stipulation, than he has to keep them in bondage. Besides, all such removals, while they confer a doubtful benefit upon the expatriated *few*, inflict a positive evil upon the enslaved *many*—because they tend to prune the Upas tree of slavery, and make it thrive more vigorously—because they strengthen oppressors, and weaken the oppressed—because it is merely draining off a surplus population—because such removals are not effected by appeals to the consciences of slaveholders, nor do they conflict with the “divine right” of slaveholding, nor do they humble the pride, extract the prejudice, or allay the hatred of the people toward the colored population. “The question before that auditory,” said Dr. Tyng, “was simply this: Whether that company of slaves should be sold for the benefit of whom it might concern [a very conscientious master to allow of this]—or whether female charity should take them kindly by the hand, and as it had rocked the cradle of the infant colony, should now, as a guardian angel, lead these captives *HOME to the land of freedom, of light, and of power?* [!—] B. B. Thacher, who next addressed the meeting, spoke of “the dark shores of the African continent.” Dr. Tyng calls darkness light, and evil good. He falsely assumes, that banishing men from their native country is leading them “home”—and he is not afraid to insult the common sense of his hearers, by representing Africa as “the land of freedom, of light, and of power.” Such nonsense is transformed into sober truth by our malignant prejudices against the colored man! Can anything be more preposterous or insane, than to talk of the superiority of enlightened, idolatrous Africa over the United States of America, in enlightening ignorance, raising up the bowed down, healing corruption and improving the human character? Think of us as a professedly Christian nation—a republican and free people—living in the noonday blaze of civilization—distinguished above all other nations for the privileges that we enjoy! Think of our various religious denominations—of the multitude of our churches—of our religious professors and teachers swarming all over the land—of our schools, and academies, and colleges! How mighty is the moral machinery, how splendid and rare the apparatus, which we are enabled to use for the redemption of a ruined world!—Then think of the piax, that this is too dark, and cruel, and wicked a land for the improvement of one-sixth part of our immense population; and that sunken, polluted, ravaged, idolatrous Africa, compared with our own, is “a land of freedom, of light, and of power,” admirably adapted to succor the oppressed, heal up the broken-hearted, give light to the blind, and bring to life the dead! This nonsense—it is worse, this solemn mockery, this insult to republicanism and Christianity, is uttered by whom? By Dr. Tyng, an acute, and intelligent, and popular preacher. How shall we account for it? On the ground that *his heart is not right toward his colored brethren*. He is a *COLONIZATIONIST*—and that one word explains the whole mystery. He does not regard our colored population as his brethren, and as American citizens, nor this their native country as their home. All his professions of philanthropy toward them are vain—he is only deceiving himself and others. Let him nail his prejudices to the cross of Christ, and let him abhor slavery as cordially as God does, and he will neither associate with southern robbers, nor conspire to exile a portion of our guiltless countrymen.

Well—120 slaves waited to be emancipated, and only needed funds enough to transport them to Africa—and Dr. Tyng pleaded their cause. Then B. B. Thacher (who maintains in the *North American Review*, that no slave ought to be emancipated, *except in condition of being sent out of the country!*) followed, and said he believed the call for money that evening “would be such an audience, and such a city, he answered as it deserved”—[as it deserved—somewhat equivocal!] “Let our enemies write on and talk on—but let us work”—[why “talk on” at that meeting? why “write on” in the *N. A. Review* and other periodicals?] He was succeeded by Mr. Bethune, who had no sooner opened his mouth than it popped, not so harmless a thing as a trope, but a palpable falsehood. “Mr. B. rose and reminded them that the man who should now lay down his \$25, would thereby enable the Society to place one liberated slave on the African shore, [shore of darkness,” says Mr. Thacher—“shore of light,” says Dr. Tyng]—and thus do more for the cause of real emancipation, than had been accomplished by the *Anti-Slavery Society* since it had an existence.” Does Mr. Bethune believe that story? Do slaveholders believe it? Do their apologists believe it? Do Judge Lynch and his disciples believe it? Not one of them. Else why do the mob suffer a colonization meeting to be held without disturbing it? Why are not brickbats prepared for the head, and feathers for the body of G. W. Bethune? Why are not rewards offered for the abduction of leading colonizationists? Why can they, if they are really doing more to *abolish slavery* with \$25, than the anti-slavery society with its tens of thousands, pass without molestation, nay with marked approbation through the slaveholding States, where abolitionists would be sacrificed instantly? Why was R. R. Gurley allowed to hold a public meeting in *New Orleans* on the 18th ultimo, and a handsome subscription made to the objects of the Society, and a committee of twelve appointed to procure donations from persons not in attendance? Mr. Bethune may answer these questions at his leisure. But our reply is, *Because his statement is not true*: it is too ridiculous for ridicule, and too false for fiction. After all these eloquent pleadings and surprising assurances, how much was raised by subscription do you think, reader? The audience was immense—perhaps not less than 3500 or 4000 persons present. It was proposed to raise a certain amount of money by individual contributions of \$25 each, Mr. Bethune standing ready to make proclamation of each gift, he prefacing the matter with the statement, “that one gentleman who had been a frequent and liberal contributor on former occasions, had just added to his former gift a donation of \$1000.” Repeated annunciations followed of individual contributions of \$25 each, says the *New York Observer*. True—but repeated how many times? Not more than six or eight times, if our ears did not deceive us. We do not think that \$200 were obtained in this manner from the vast assembly! It was so trifling a sum that the *Observer* says nothing about it. In addition to it, a collection of small change was also taken up. At

the anti-slavery meeting, upwards of *twenty-one thousand dollars* were pledged to carry on its operations, and it was resolved to raise the sum of **ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS** during the present year.

MR. BETHUNE'S DEFENCE.

This individual, in his *exordium*, said—“Last year, after having spoken in behalf of the Colonization cause, I found, in looking into the columns of the Liberator, that I had become the owner of a large estate, which I knew nothing of. According to Mr. Garrison, I was largely interested in slave property. It is not true that we made a positive affirmation. In commenting upon Mr. Bethune's folly and wickedness, as displayed in the *Brick Church* last year, we attempted to account for his zeal in behalf of the south by stating that we understood he was interested in slave property by marriage, for so we were told in Philadelphia. We gave it as a *report*, not as a *fact*. Why did Mr. Bethune repeat the insinuation? Evidently, because he viewed it as slanderous—as tarnishing his reputation—as being derogatory to the character of an upright man—for he has such a tender conscience, and so liberal a heart, that he says if he should come into the possession of a cotton plantation, *he is sure he should not know what to do with it*, unless he sold it, and put the proceeds into the treasury of the Colonization Society!! Then we have a few questions to ask. Does Mr. Bethune mean to concede, that it would be dishonest for him to be interested in slave property? Would it be inhuman for Mr. Bethune to be interested in slave property? Is it praiseworthy, and deserving of public proclamation, in Mr. Bethune, not to be interested in slave property? Then who can honestly or honorably be a slaveholder? And why is Mr. Bethune the best friend and ally of slaveholders? ‘Birds of a feather flock together,’ is an adage as true as it is familiar.

N. B. This is the individual who sneered at Mr. Thompson last year, by saying that he had come to this country “to make speeches.” His speeches could be answered only by brickbats, and rotten eggs, and daggers, and mobs! They caused this despoile nation to tremble—and yet they were worthy of Mr. B.'s merriment! Indeed!

SELF-DEFENCE. Webb, of the *Courier and Enquirer*, is a brutal pugilist in practice, and a revengeful duellist in spirit—very jealous of his honor, and prompt to repel any encroachment upon his rights—and, abolitionists and the colored people out of the question, he is ready to eulogise the man who will return blow for blow, and cursing for cursing. Alluding to the late pro-slavery disturbance in Marion county, Missouri, he says—“One Muldrow, an abolition emissary, took occasion to stab and murder a respectable individual in a church, merely for expressing his abhorrence of the abolition movements”—i. e. merely for insulting the feelings, disturbing the proceedings, and invading the rights of a whole congregation, in the most profane and insolent manner. We give Webb's account of the affair—“Immediately after the sermon, [by Rev. Dr. Nelson,] Muldrow rose with a paper in one hand, and a knife in the other, and commenced reading the paper, requesting such as favored the abolitionists to subscribe such sums as they thought proper for the furtherance of their objects. Dr. Bosley rose and said, that none but a [d—d] scoundrel would act as Muldrow was doing; and after some alteration, [!] in which the Doctor drew a pistol, Muldrow plunged his knife into the Doctor's side—whether fatally or not, was doubtful; but those who were entertained of his recovery. Thus it is conceded by Webb, that Bosley was the assailant: in any other case, he would have eulogized the conduct of Muldrow as brave and spirited, and justified by the brutal attack upon him. But it is his opinion, not only that abolitionists deserve to be mobbed even in a church, but that if they will not suffer their dearest rights to be trampled upon with impunity, and themselves to be shot down like mad dogs, they are still more deserving of bonds and death! Suppose the persecuted should turn persecutors, and break up colonization and other pro-slavery meetings in a riotous manner, and attempt to lynch southern slaveholders who might be found here at the north—what would he say then?

But Webb has not told all the truth—no marvel. Not only did Bosley interrupt a religious meeting in a profane and rude manner, abusing Dr. Nelson, and accusing him of being the cause of all the disturbance, but he struck Muldrow with a sword-cane, then drew a pistol and snapped it at M., and then attacked him with his cane, before M. grabbed him, or did him any injury. Webb says at the commencement of his paragraph, that Bosley was *murdered*—at the close of it he says, ‘hopes were entertained of his recovery.’

We may do condemn Col. Muldrow for resorting to violence even to save his life, because we believe non-resistance under such circumstances is a duty—but Webb does not. [!] It is proper to state, that Muldrow is *not an abolitionist*. He belongs to Mr. Joseph Tracy's corrupt little party, who are for indemnifying the masters for their slaves, i. e. rewarding the robbers of the poor and needy, by the aid of government.

Recent accounts from Marion, state that Dr. Bosley is fast recovering.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. The startling but eloquent speech of this gentleman in the House of Representatives, in reference to the disastrous prospects before us, arising from the existence of southern slavery, the cruel treatment of the Indians, and the conquest of Texas, is full of solemn, and perhaps seasonable warnings, especially to the people of the free States. Undoubtedly, some terrible judgments are in reserve for this hypocritical, oppressive and perfidious nation, and the glittering sword of the Almighty is to be drawn against it. Wo to its inhabitants,—to those whose hands are defiled with blood, and who devour the poor and defenceless!

Mr. Adams thinks that if *Texas* should be wrested from Mexico, and annexed to the Union, Great Britain would take possession of Cuba and Porto Rico, by session from Spain, or by the batteries from her wooden walls— and if you ask her by what authority she has done it, she will ask you, in return, by what authority you have exended your sea coast from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo. ‘What,’ he asks, ‘in a presidential and military point of view would be the addition of Texas to your domain? It would be weakness, and not power.’ It is worthy of remark, however, that in a debate on the 7th ultimo, Mr. Adams stated that under president Monroe's administration, ‘he (Mr. A.) was for holding *Texas*; no other man, in the administration, was.’ Now he inquires—“As to the annexation of Texas to your Confederation, for what do you want it? Are you not large and unwieldy enough already?” It seems he did not think so formerly: we are glad he has changed his opinion.

Of the resolution which elicited this speech, Mr.

A. says—“We are called to vote upon it without knowing how deep it will die into the public purse. It is, I believe, the first example of a system of gratuitous donations to our own countrymen, infinitely more formidable by its consequences as a precedent, than from anything appearing upon its face.” Yet, with surprising inconsistency, he adds—“I shall, nevertheless, vote for it.” Who avail these alarming objections, in view of his support of the resolution? He calls it a *lascivious* disposal of the public funds—yet he votes for it. He says he shall seek for a principle which may justify him in the judgment of his constituents—i. e. he shall seek for a principle to justify the sacrifice of principle! Nay, he promises to ‘vote again and again’ forodrafts from the treasury for the same purpose, should they become necessary, till the treasury itself shall be drained! We are not wise enough to perceive any consistency or principle in such conduct.

GENERAL MEETING. During the sittings of the General Assembly at Pittsburgh, that vain, shallow, but crafty and indefatigable scoundrel, ELLIOT CRESSON of Philadelphia, attempted to give an impulse to the odious cause of African Colonization, by lecturing on the Sabbath days in the churches, and holding meetings on the week evening, from week to week. The editor of the *Evangelist* says, that, being in Pittsburgh on Friday evening, seeing a notice in the papers of the city for a ‘General Meeting,’ to be held in the 3d church, and hearing a notification read from the moderator's chair of the General Assembly to the same effect, and that Mr. Cresson and others were to speak, he went seasonably to the place. The hour of eight arrived, and brought E. C. to an assembly of 40 persons, ‘all told,’ which was afterward increased to about 100! His only supporter was the Rev. Dr. Palmer of Charleston, a slaveholder.

At a subsequent meeting which was somewhat larger, harangued in favor of the old handmaiden of slavery were made by Rev. Dr. Witherspoon, of S. C. and two or three other revend robbers and docto-divinity oppressors, and by Rev. Dr. Beecher, who, like R. R. Gurley, ‘goes with the south,’ and who thinks that by letting slavery alone 200 years, and saying nothing about it, it will by that time be defeated! ‘How has the gold become dim?’

Question— Why cannot abolition and colonization go together? **Another—** Why is it that a notice of a colonization meeting can be read in the General Assembly, (a majority of which is undoubtedly hostile to the abolition cause,) when the question of slavery is indefinitely postponed by that body?

PANEGYRIC. The *N. York Courier and Enquirer* styles the Anti-Slavery Office ‘the *murder-mill* in Nassau-street,’ and the officers and members of the Society, ‘that abominable band of ruffians.’ This ‘hard language’ is altogether too soft, we suppose, to excite any emotion of disapprobation in the sensitive breasts of the editors of the *Vermont Chronicle*, *Boston Recorder*, and *Christian Mirror*. Such men as Arthur Tappan, William Jay, and Gerrit Smith, may be stigmatized as ruffians and murderers, and these editors not be ruffled at all in their complacency; but they instantly become indignant and vehement, whenever they hear the robbers of God's poor, the oppressors of the weak and defenceless, the traffickers in slaves and souls of men, called by their proper names!

TRICK OF SLAVEHOLDERS. There was an incident of an Anti-Slavery Society in Belpre, Ohio, a few weeks ago. The mob organized in Parkersburg, Va. on the opposite bank, but were prevailed upon by the more sober citizens to desist from violence. The slaveholders in that place, made the blacks believe that, if abolitionists succeeded, the slaves would all be massacred!—Hitherto the assertion has been, that if we should succeed, the slaveholders would all be massacred—now, it seems, it is only the slaves who would suffer. Nothing, however, would be killed but the monster slavery—nothing destroyed but whips, collars, chains and thumb-screws.

REV. DR. NELSON. It appears that this devoted and self-sacrificing servant of God has been driven out of Marion county, with his family, under the most distressing and perilous circumstances, by the insanely ferocious supporters of the hellish system of slavery. The experience of every day is testifying, in the most solemn manner, that the slaveholding spirit of this country is full of deadly hostility to all that is humane in practice, as invaluable in freedom of thought, or holy and precious in religion. What shall the end of these things be?

SPRINTED. The editors of the *Vermont State Journal* make the following spirited call, in view of the alarming fact that Mr. Calhoun's Bill had been read a third time in the Senate:

We earnestly recommend to our fellow citizens throughout the State to call *TOWN MEETINGS* without the least delay, to pronounce public opinion on the infamous Bill now before the Senate of the United States, commonly known as *CAHOUN'S GAG LAW*. *Freemen of Vermont!* Let your voice be heard! ‘Eternal vigilance is the price of Liberty.’

Fortunately, the Gag Law has since been rejected, so that the meetings summoned will not be needed—no thanks, but all imaginable condemnation to Martin Van Buren.

DR. BEECHER. The *Cincinnati Journal* makes proclamation—probably by authority—to this effect:—Dr. Beecher has from the first disapproved of anti-slavery measures: if there is any change, it is yet to come. We protest against representing him to be, or about to be, what he never was, and is never likely to be, i. e. an abolitionist. He stands upon the ground [rolls in the mire] of colonization and gradual emancipation. In this matter, he is recreant to his country, himself, and his God.

BACKING OUT. Mr. Tracy says of his article respecting the New England Convention—

Since it was published, we have heard of several persons—who say that they are ‘very well satisfied’ with the Convention. Probably, many others could be found, who are of the same mind; but, at that time, we had found none of them.

QUERY— At that time, he had found any abolitionists who were not ‘very well satisfied’ with the Convention? Yea, or nay.

A GREAT NUISANCE. The Grand Jury of Frederick county, in Maryland, have presented the State as ‘an insupportable nuisance,’ on account of its political inequalities. We present it as a worse nuisance than the people of the free States. In this matter, he inquires—“What is the grand jury of?”

The Colonization Society is popular in the Southern of America, New Orleans, R. R. Gurley has been speechifying in that city, and obtained about \$1000 in aid of his expatriating scheme. This fact shows the perfect agreement that exists between slavery and colonization.

Extract from a letter dated New Orleans, June 2d.—Gen. Houston is in bad health, and without good attention I fear we lose his life—his wound in the foot is very bad, and I think must mortify. He is quite unable to stand, and fainted yesterday, when a little fatigued. We trust the above may not be true, or at least exaggerated.—*Baltimore Gaz.*

THE SLAVE TRADE.—‘We learn,’ says the *Courier Francais*, ‘that the convention for the suppression of the slave trade had just been signed by the minister for Foreign Affairs and the Swedish Minister, who on Friday sent it off by express to Stockholm.’

BOSTON RECORDER.

We have charged the editor of this paper with misrepresenting both the anti-slavery meeting at New York and the New England A. S. Convention, and of making assertions which we doubted his ability to sustain. We have challenged him to produce his evidence—but he is dumb—convicted of gross injustice before all the people.

He asserts that ‘nobody was very well satisfied with the Convention.’ We have already shown, that no statement could be farther from the truth. An estimable lady, known to us only by her good works, has forwarded to us the following letter, by way of rebuke to Mr. Tracy, and of encouragement to us:—

BOSTON, June 9th, 1836.

MR. GARRISON:

Permit me to request your acceptance of the enclosed five dollars, to aid in the glorious cause in which you are embarked.

From one who was very well satisfied with the N. E. Anti-Slavery Convention.

N. B. May all who read the *Recorder* send you a

WASHINGTON, Saturday June 18th.

This has been rather an interesting day. In the Senate, Mr. Clay, from the committee on Foreign Relations, made a report on the subject of our relations with Texas, concluding with a resolution that this Government ought to recognise the independence of Texas, whenever it shall satisfactorily appear that Texas has a government capable of maintaining itself, and of performing its obligations to other nations.

THE TRIAL OF REUBEN CRANDALL, M. D. charged with publishing seditious libels, by circulating the publications of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Before the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia held at Washington in April, 1836, occupying the court the period of ten days.

This report is from the hands of Dr. Crandall himself, and occupies a pamphlet of sixty-two pages. It contains the speeches of the prosecuting attorney and counsel, in addition to the examination of witnesses, &c., and is full satisfactory. As settling some interesting points in law, no less than in determination how far that law effects an important principle and question, in a slaveholding district, the Trial presents great attraction above the interest usually felt in cases of libel.

As there has been another report of the Trial published, it may be well to add, this having been issued by Dr. Crandall himself, his friends are advised to order the present edition, printed by H. R. Piercy, of this city. It may be had at the Anti-Slavery Office, and we presume at the Book stores, or of Dr. Crandall at 417 Houston street.

FOURTH OF JULY.

Are abolitionists awake? Are they sincere in their professions of sympathy for the slaves? If so, they will embrace every possible opportunity for pleading their cause. On this day we are still permitted to speak of liberty, emancipation and equal rights. Let us embrace it with as much eagerness as if we each of us had a brother now toiling beneath the lash of a taskmaster, with no friend near him to pour the balm of consolation into his aching bosom,—obliged to retire from his bitter task to his cheerless hut, when no kind sister awaited his return, and no loved friend could soothe his troubled spirit. Let each of us place ourselves in the condition of one of those wretched beings, and consider how we should wish our profession friends to act,—and then go and do likewise. It will be very easy to get up a meeting in every village in the land. The occasion can be turned to good account in the advancement of our holy cause. If popular orators cannot be had, no time can be more suitable for making a maiden speech. Reader, if you are an abolitionist, this is addressed to you, and it is your duty to see that it is attended to, in your town or neighborhood. Don't forget to take a liberal collection. N. S.

Question—Why cannot abolition and colonization go together?

Another—Why is it that a notice of a colonization meeting can be read in the General Assembly?

On Monday, June 13, Arkansas, (slaveholding) and Michigan, (free) were added to this “glorious Union.”—Again slaveholders, and their northern co-partners, exhibited their hypocrisy, and uncovered their nakedness, revealing to the

